REMARKS

Claims 1-24 and 26-29 are now pending in the application. Claim 25 was previously cancelled. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection(s) in view of the remarks contained herein.

INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

The Examiner's attention is also respectfully drawn to the Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement being filed concurrently herewith.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-11, 16-24, and 28-29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Schofield et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,498,620 B2). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 10-15 and 24-27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schofield et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,498,620 B2) in view of Shimizu (U.S. Pat. No. 5,796,991). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 1, 9

Applicants respectfully note that Schofield does not disclose nor suggest the feature of the claimed inventions "changing a position or so of the virtual point of view in accordance with a running state of the vehicle" at least. Schofield merely discloses at col. 21, line 41 – col. 22, line 6, the application of the rearview vision system to adaptive cruise control using infrared communication, in which the speed of the trailing vehicle is

controlled according to separation distance with leading vehicles. Specifically, the speed and distance, and the separation of the vehicles as well as the rate of change of separation of the vehicles, which have been determined by image processor, are communicated to the trailing vehicle by an infrared transmitter in order to control the speed of the trailing vehicle, in Schofield. Such disclosure is not related with the subject matter of the claimed invention or changing the virtual point of view.

Claim 8

Schofield does not disclose nor suggest the feature of the claimed invention "controlling capturing of an image outside a view range of the virtual point of view in accordance with a running state of the vehicle" at least. Applicants have reviewed the Schofield reference and would respectfully note that the part of Schofield indicated by Examiner, col. 14, lines 1-7 has no relation to the claimed invention.

Claims 10, 16

In Fig. 3 of Schofield, even if the composite image 42 corresponds to the first image of the claimed invention, the element corresponding to the second image of the claimed invention is not shown. Perhaps the Examiner supposes that the left image portion 44 and the right image portion 46 correspond to the first and second image of the claimed inventions respectively. If so, this is a misunderstanding. In fact, the left image portion 44, the right image portion 46 and the center image portion 48 are common in viewpoint and model. The second image of the claimed invention is also different from the first image in a viewpoint or a model.

Therefore, Schofield does not disclose nor suggest the feature of the claimed invention "generating an image including a first image viewed from the virtual point of view and a second image viewed from a different viewpoint and different in a model" at least.

Claims 17, 23

The composite image 42 of Fig. 3 in Schofield is a panoramic view rearward of the vehicle, which is entirely different from the vehicle region of the claimed invention. Also, the graphic overlays 70a, 70b of Fig. 6 are the anticipated path of movement of vehicle, which are entirely different from the attention drawing region of the claimed invention. Therefore, Schofield does not disclose nor suggest the feature of the claimed invention "displaying a vehicle region and an attention drawing region at the surroundings of the vehicle" at least.

Claim 24

Schofield and Shimizu do not disclose nor suggest the feature of the claimed invention "the pixel data other than the camera images show the vehicle or a blind spot region" at least. As stated above, the graphic overlays 70a, 70b of Fig. 6 in Schofield are the anticipated path of movement of vehicle, which are entirely different from the vehicle and the blind spot region of the claimed invention.

Claim 28

Schofield discloses at col. 14, line 30 – col. 15, line 2 that the data streams from image-capturing devices 14, 16 are mapped to the pixel array of display 20. However,

there is no suggestion of mapping data describing a rate of necessity with respect to each of the pixel data, in Schofield.

Claim 29

Examiner states no specific matters with regard to Claim 29. Schofield does not disclose nor suggest the feature of the claimed invention "cutting out a mapping table from an original mapping table" at least.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: Sept 16, 2004

By: Greg Stobbs
Gregory A. Stobbs
Reg. No. 28,764

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

GAS/kk